

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-28 are currently pending. Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 18-20, 22-23 and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and claims 2, 5-7, 9-17, 21 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

II. Amendments to claims

Claims 1, 9, 18 and 28 has been amended as noted in marked-up version above.

III. Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 18-20, 22-23 and 27-28 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,623,529 (Lakritz). The present rejection is improper as Lakritz fails to disclose all of the claimed limitations of claims 1, 3-4, 8, 18-20, 22-23 and 27-28.

Claims 1 and 28 recite, *inter alia*, receiving input text in the computing device, determining whether the initialization data includes font data to create the document, wherein the document allows for the display of the input text. Claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, receiving input text in the computing device, determining whether the computing device has font data stored therein to create the document, wherein the document allows for the display of the input text. Lakritz fails to disclose the claimed input text, the determination of whether font data is available for creating the document and the document allowing for the display of the input text.

In the Examiner-noted passage of Lakritz on col. 4, lines 20-21, the visitor module intercepts the input text, but this interception is for the purpose of generating a user feedback form. The end of the sentence beginning on col. 4, lines 20-21 provides that this input text is written to a form database and may be translated "later via the Workflow Manager." (col. 4, line 23).

As noted above, claims 1, 18 and 28 recite determining whether the initialization data includes (computing device has) font data to create the document, wherein the document allows for the display of the input text. In support of the present rejection, the Examiner asserts that Lakritz describes whether the initialization data can create the document on the computing device at col. 4, lines 11-13. This Examiner-cited passage describes a well-known caching technique used for website access. This caching technique differs from the claimed invention as the caching approach determines if a website has been previously accessed and if so, loads the content of the website (e.g. text and pictures) from a local cache. In other words, under the Lakritz system, the input text for the display is the URL request and the display is composed of cached files. Also, this is contrary to the previous position that the input text is provided for a user feedback form because Lakritz provides the form to a form database. The placement of the input text in a form database is contrary to the claimed invention of determining whether the initialization data includes (computing device has) the font data to create the document, wherein the document allows for the display of the input text.

Regarding claims 3-4, 8, 19-20, 22-23 and 27, which depend from claims 1 and 18 respectively, it is submitted that these claims are similarly allowable for the reasons provided in connection with claims 1 and 18. In addition, it is further submits that claims 3-4, 8, 19-20, 22-23 and 27 contain further patentable subject matter not disclosed by Lakritz.

Therefore, for at the least the reasons stated above, it is submitted that the present rejection is improper as Lakritz fails to disclose all of the claimed limitations. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 6-7, 9-16, 21 and 24-26

Claims 2, 6-7, 9-16, 21 and 24-26 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,432,948 (Davis). The present rejection is improper as Lakritz in combination with Davis fails to disclose all of the claimed limitations of claims 2, 6-7, 9-16, 21 and 24-26.

Regarding claim 9, Applicants respectfully resubmit the above-offered position regarding the teachings of Lakritz with respect to claims 1, 18 and 28. In support of the present rejection, the Examiner asserts the that Davis teaches of a computer system. The teachings of Davis fail to overcome the above-noted deficiencies in the disclosure of Lakritz as applied to the claim 9, as noted with respect to the above discussion regarding claims 1, 18 and 28. Therefore, for at least the above-submitted reasons, Applicant submit the

present rejection is improper because a combination of Lakritz with Davis fails to produce the claimed present invention of claim 9.

Regarding claims 2, 6-7, 10-16, 21 and 24-26, which depend from claims 1, 9 and 18 respectively, it is submitted that these claims are similarly allowable for the reasons provided in connection with claims 1, 9 and 18. In addition, it is further submits that claims 2, 6-7, 9-16, 21 and 24-26 contain further patentable subject matter not disclosed by the combination of Lakritz and Davis. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 17

Claim 17 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz in view of Davis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,567 (Christensen). Regarding claim 17, which depends from claim 9, it is submitted that this claim is similarly allowable for the reasons provided in connection with claim 9. In addition, it is further submitted that claim 17 contains further patentable subject matter not disclosed by the combination of Lakritz, Davis and Christensen. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims 1-28 are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: December 6, 2004

By: 

Timothy J. Bechen
Reg. No. 48,126